

First order phase transition in a self-propelled particles model with variable angular range of interaction.

Mihir Durve* and Ahmed Sayeed†

Department of Physics, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India 411007

(Dated: March 25, 2016)

We have carried out a Monte Carlo simulation of a modified version of Vicsek model for the motion of self-propelled particles in two dimensions. In this model the neighborhood of interaction of a particle is a sector of the circle with the particle at the center (rather than the whole circle as in the original Vicsek model). The sector is centered along the direction of the velocity of the particle, and the half-opening angle of this sector is called the ‘view-angle’. We vary the view-angle over its entire range and study the change in the nature of the collective motion of the particles. We find that ordered collective motion persists down to remarkably small view-angles. And at a certain critical view-angle the collective motion of the system undergoes a first order phase transition to a disordered state. We also find that the reduction in the view-angle can in fact increase the order in the system significantly. We show that the directionality of the interaction, and not only the radial range of the interaction, plays an important role in the determination of the nature of the above phase transition.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are many systems, natural as well as artificial, that consist of moving and interacting ‘self-propelled’ agents. Biological systems such as schools of fish [1], flocks of birds [2, 3], bacterial colonies [4–6], artificial systems such as ‘Kobots’ (robots specially developed for the study of flocking) [7], platinum-silica particles in hydrogen peroxide solution [8], carbon coated Janus particles in water-lutidine mixture [9], and vibrating rods [10–12] are some examples. One remarkable characteristic of these systems is that under certain conditions they are capable of displaying extraordinary collective dynamics, such as highly cooperative collective motion and complex moving patterns [13–19].

One of the simplest models proposed to describe the motion of a collection of agents which have a tendency to ‘move as their neighbors do’ (birds in a flock is an obvious example) is the one by Vicsek et al. [13], now commonly known as the Vicsek model. In this model a collection of point particles move with the same, constant speed, and each particle at discrete time intervals ‘adjusts’ its direction of motion so as to move along the mean direction of motion of the particles in its local (short range) neighborhood. This direction adjustment is imperfect due to the presence of noise in the system. Vicsek et al. found that the nature of the collective motion of the particles depends on the level of this noise and the particle density of the system. For high densities and low noise levels the collective motion attains an ordered state in which the particles move largely in a common direction. For low densities and high noise levels there is no such collective motion and particles essentially perform uncorrelated random walks. And as the noise level is

varied (for a fixed particle density), or as the particle density is varied (for a fixed noise level), the system displays a non-equilibrium order-disorder phase transition. This subject has been recently reviewed by Vicsek [20] and Menzel [21].

A number of variants of the Vicsek models have been studied, and among them of particular interest to the present work are the ones where certain constraints are imposed on the angular range of the local neighborhood of a particle, or on the extent of the reorientation of the particle’s direction of motion. These studies have found that these restrictions, which might naively be expected to reduce the degree of order in the system, can in fact enhance it. Tian et al. [22] as well as Li et al. [23] found that restricting the angular range of interaction can reduce the ‘consensus time’ (the time taken by the system to attain the stationary value of the order parameter). Similarly Gao et al. [24] found that restricting the angle of velocity reorientation can increase the order parameter. In the model that they studied, in a single update particle directions are allowed to change within a limited range. And Yang et al. [25] found that discarding short range interactions can increase the order parameter.

In this work we too study the effects of variation in the angular range of interaction on the collective motion of the particles in the Vicsek model. One of the motivations for the Vicsek model was to understand the collective motions of the large moving groups of living beings, such as flocks of bird or schools of fish, where each agent is expected to move, as far as possible, in the same direction as its close neighbors. In the Vicsek model the neighborhood observed by the agent is a circle (for a two dimensional system) centered on the current position of that agent, regardless of its direction of motion. This is quite unrealistic, because an agent such as a bird or a fish does not have a 360° view of its surroundings. For example, the cyclopean field of view (i.e., combined field of view of both eyes [26]) of the grey-headed Albatross is about 270° in the horizontal plane [27], and that of *Dasyatis sabina*

* mihirdurve@physics.unipune.ac.in

† Correspondence to: sayeed@physics.unipune.ac.in

fish is about 327° in the horizontal plane [26]. This kind of restricted view of the neighborhood also plays a role in the phototactic motion of certain marine organisms such as *Platynereis* larvae [28]. Thus exploration of the effects of limitation of the angular range of interaction neighborhood should be of interest in the study of all those processes where the Vicsek model is relevant.

In this report we present the results of the numerical simulations of the Vicsek model in which the angular range of the interaction neighborhood is restricted. We have measured the order parameter of the system as a function of the angular range of the interaction neighborhood (radius of the neighborhood held fixed). We find that the order parameter of the system varies non-monotonically as the angular range of the interaction neighborhood is decreased, and at a certain point the system undergoes a first order (i.e., discontinuous) phase transition to a disordered state. We have also measured the variation of the order parameter as the radius of the interaction is reduced (without restricting the angular range of the interaction neighborhood), and find that the resulting change in the nature of the collective motion is qualitatively different.

II. MODEL

The model of self-propelled particles we have studied is a modification of the Vicsek model. In this model the interaction neighborhood of a particle is not a circle centered on that particle, but a sector of this circle, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The neighborhood sector S_i has an opening angle of 2ϕ and is centered about the direction of velocity of the i^{th} particle. We shall call the half opening angle ϕ as the ‘view-angle’, which can vary from 0 to π . For $\phi = \pi$ this model reduces to the original Vicsek model.

Simulations are carried out in a box of size $L \times L$ with N particles, with usual periodic boundary conditions in both directions. The mean particle density is given by $\rho = N/L^2$. The initial positions \mathbf{r}_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$) are assigned randomly with uniform probability within the box. The initial directions of the particles θ_i are also assigned randomly in the range $[-\pi, \pi]$ with uniform probability. All the particles have the same, constant speed v_0 . The velocities and the positions of the particles at time $t + 1$ are obtained from the velocities and positions at time t using the following update rules. First we update velocities of all the particles simultaneously with

$$\mathbf{v}_i(t+1) = v_0 \mathcal{R}(\theta) \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)$ is the unit velocity in the direction of the mean velocity of the particles in the neighborhood S_i of the i^{th} particle, *including* the i^{th} particle itself (see Fig.

1), and is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \frac{\sum_{j \in S_i} \mathbf{v}_j(t)}{\left| \sum_{j \in S_i} \mathbf{v}_j(t) \right|}. \quad (2)$$

$\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is the rotation operator which rotates the vector it acts upon (i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)$) by an angle θ . The angle θ is a random variable uniformly distributed over the interval $[-\eta\pi, \eta\pi]$. Here $|\dots|$ denotes the norm of the vector, η is the level (i.e., amplitude) of the noise that can be varied from 0 to 1.

Following the velocity updates, the positions are updated with

$$\mathbf{r}_i(t+1) = \mathbf{r}_i(t) + \mathbf{v}_i(t+1)\Delta t, \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta t = 1$. This update scheme is known as the ‘forward update’ in the literature [29].




FIG. 1. (Color online) The neighborhood S_i of the i^{th} particle. The i^{th} particle is shown as the red dot, and S_i is the sector bound by the two radii marked as R . The red dot and the blue dots indicate the particles lying within the neighborhood, and the black dots indicate particles outside it. The vector \mathbf{v} indicates the direction of the velocity of the i^{th} particle. The view-angle ϕ is the half opening angle of the neighborhood at the center.

To quantify the degree of order in the collective motion of the particles a scalar order parameter $\psi(t)$ is defined as

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{Nv_0} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}_i(t) \right|. \quad (4)$$

It can be readily seen that in the perfectly ordered state when all the particles are moving in the same direction $\psi(t) = 1$, and in the completely disordered state when the directions of motion are completely random $\psi(t) = 0$ (in the limit of $N \rightarrow \infty$). In this report we use the phrase ‘ordered state’ to mean the stationary state of the system for which $\psi(t) > 0$ in the limit of $N \rightarrow \infty$.

III. SIMULATION DETAILS

In this work the data presented in Figs. 2 to 6 is produced with the following parameters fixed: the number

density $\rho = N/L^2 = 1$, the particle speed $v_0 = 0.5$, the noise level $\eta = 0.3$, and the interaction neighborhood radius $R = 1$. For the data presented in Figs. 7 and 8 the parameter R is varied from 0 to 1, with all other parameters same as above. Box sizes L in the range of 16 to 36 (i.e., particle numbers N in the range 256 to 1296) were used. We have measured the order parameter $\psi(t)$ as a function of the view angle ϕ , which was varied over the entire range 0 to π . Measurements were averaged over 20 independent realizations, with each realization consisting of 10^5 to 10^7 time-steps. In the results we have presented in the following section we have used the time-averaged order parameter $\langle\psi(t)\rangle$, measured as a function of the view-angle ϕ . For satisfactory averages we have to have a time series $\psi(t)$ of a length T much larger than the correlation time for that series. The length of the time series T is effectively the length of a single realization multiplied by number of independent realizations. Near the critical value of ϕ , the T values are $5.2 \times 10^5, 4.9 \times 10^6, 1.3 \times 10^7, 1.9 \times 10^8$ for system sizes $L = 16, 20, 24, 28$ respectively. The correlation time τ can be estimated from the autocorrelation function for $\psi(t)$ as

$$C(\Delta t) = \frac{\langle(\psi(t + \Delta t) - \bar{\psi})(\psi(t) - \bar{\psi})\rangle}{\sigma_{\psi}^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{\psi}$ and σ_{ψ}^2 are the mean and variance of $\psi(t)$ for a single time series. The angular brackets indicate averaging over all the initial time instants t . The correlation time τ can be estimated by fitting the autocorrelation function $C(\Delta t)$ to the exponential decay function $e^{-\Delta t/\tau}$ (when that is possible), or by using the ‘integrated correlation time’ definition

$$\tau = \sum_{\Delta t=1} C(\Delta t), \quad (6)$$

where the sum is cut off at the first negative value of $C(\Delta t)$. We have used this definition to estimate τ [30]. Near a phase transition the correlation time τ increases rapidly with the system size L , and for a given system size it increases rapidly as the phase transition is approached. We estimate that close to the transition (i.e for $|\phi - \phi_c| \lesssim 0.01$) $\tau \approx 4 \times 10^2, 3 \times 10^3, 2.7 \times 10^4, 5.5 \times 10^5$ for $L = 16, 20, 24, 28$ respectively. Thus we have the total length of the time series T much larger than the correlation time. For the results presented in the following section $T = 13000\tau, 1650\tau, 510\tau, 360\tau$ are for the system sizes $L = 16, 20, 24, 28$ respectively, close to the transition. Further away from the transition the T values come out to be much larger multiples of τ .

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tian et al.[22] and Li et al. [23] have studied one aspect of the question that we are interested in the present

work. They varied the view angle ϕ and measured the ‘consensus time’, that is, the time taken for the system to achieve the stationary value of the order parameter ψ , in the absence and presence of the noise. They made a counterintuitive observation that the consensus time can be shorter for $\phi < \pi$, i.e., restricting the angular range of the particle interactions can speed up the establishment of the ordered collective motion. They found that there is an optimum value for the view-angle for which the consensus time is the shortest. A similar observation was made by Wang et al. [31], who considered not only variable view-angle but also interaction strengths weighted by the separations between the particle and its neighbors.

With the above mentioned earlier studies in mind, we were interested in the effect of varying the view angle ϕ on the nature of collective motion of the particles in the modified Vicsek model considered in this study. We have made three important observations: (i) It is not only that the collective motion attains consensus faster with restricted view angle (as found in the reports [22, 23]), but the stationary value of order parameter can also increase with the decreasing view angle. (ii) The ordered state can persist down to quite low view-angles for non-zero noise (iii) As the view angle is reduced, the system undergoes a first order phase transition from the ordered state to the disordered state.

In Fig. 2 we have shown the time-averaged order parameter $\langle\psi(t)\rangle$ as a function of the view angle ϕ for four different system sizes. (In this and all other plots the symbols are the data and the connecting lines are guides to the eye.) The phase transition is clearly seen for all the four sizes, but there is considerable finite size effect. For the system sizes $L = 24$ and $L = 28$ the transition is quite sharp and recognizably discontinuous to the eye, but further analysis discussed below makes it clear that it is indeed of the first order. It can be noted that as the view-angle is decreased, the order parameter varies slowly but non-monotonically. It at first decreases slightly, and then increases to a maximum near the transition, and then drops to low values (not exactly zero, due to the finite size of the system) that characterize a disordered state.

In numerical simulations it is not a simple matter to estimate precisely the critical value of the control parameter and to determine the order of the phase-transition, because the finite size effects ‘round and shift’ the transition. A complete treatment of the numerical simulation of a phase transition would require a full-fledged finite size scaling (FSS) analysis [32, 33]. This theory of finite size scaling was originally developed for the equilibrium phase transition, but now it is known that much of this analysis is applicable to far-from-equilibrium phase transitions also, such as the ones observed in the Vicsek model [14, 34–36]. Here we do not wish to carry out a full finite size scaling analysis for the phase transitions we have observed, because that would require very large system sizes and times, and is quite prohibitive for us




FIG. 2. Order parameter $\langle \psi(t) \rangle$ vs view-angle ϕ (in units of π) plots for system sizes (a) $L = 16$ (b) $L = 20$ (c) $L = 24$ (d) $L = 28$.

at present. Here we only wish to estimate the critical value of the control parameter ϕ with moderate accuracy and establish that the phase transition is of the first order. This can be done using a function of the moments of the order parameter, known as the ‘Binder cumulant’, defined by [32]

$$G(\eta, L) = 1 - \frac{\langle \psi^4(t) \rangle}{3\langle \psi^2(t) \rangle^2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\langle \psi^2(t) \rangle$ and $\langle \psi^4(t) \rangle$ are time-averaged second and fourth moments of the order parameter, for given values of η and L (for averaging details please see the previous section). For second order phase transition the Binder cumulant is known to take a value independent of the system size L , and so if the Binder cumulant is plotted as a function of the control parameter for different system sizes all the curves are expected to cross at the critical value of the order parameter. On the other hand, for first order phase transitions the Binder cumulant dips towards the negative values at the transition point, the dip becoming sharper and deeper as the system size increases. In Fig. 3 we have shown the plots for Binder cumulant G as a function of the view-angle ϕ . For the system size $L = 16$ we do not see any dip, as the finite size effects are too large. But for system sizes $L = 20, 24, 28$ we have very clear dips. Taking the value ϕ for the minimum of G as the estimated critical value ϕ_c , we get $\phi_c = 0.21\pi, 0.18\pi, 0.1625\pi$ for the system sizes $L = 20, 24, 28$ respectively. Also, we get $G \approx 2/3$ in the ordered phase and $G \approx 1/3$ in the disordered state [14], as expected.

We have also calculated the distribution of the instantaneous order parameter $\psi(t)$ in Fig. 4 close to the estimated critical points. For a first order phase transition at the transition point both the phases coexist, and over




FIG. 3. Binder cumulant G vs view-angle ϕ (in units of π) plots for the system sizes (a) $L = 16$ (b) $L = 20$ (c) $L = 24$ (d) $L = 28$.

a period of time the system fluctuates between the ordered and disordered states. The distribution for the system size $L = 16$ (Fig. 4(a)) is a broad unimodal curve, which means due to the finite size effects the distinction between two phases is blurred, consistent with the binder cumulant plot for the same system size (Fig. 3(a)). But for the system sizes $L = 20, 24, 28$ (Figs. 4 (b), (c) and (d) respectively) we have clear bimodal distributions, showing the presence of both the ordered and disordered phases. This is also seen in Fig. 5, which gives a sample of the time series $\psi(t)$ for the system size $L = 28$. Here we clearly see the system abruptly and stochastically switching between the two phases, one with average order parameter $\langle \psi(t) \rangle \approx 0.6$ (the ordered state) and the one with average order parameter $\langle \psi(t) \rangle \approx 0.1$ (the disordered state), which agrees with the distribution peak positions in Fig. 4.

Another signature of a first order phase transition is the presence of hysteresis phenomenon near the transition point. If the control parameter is ramped up and down across the critical point at a small, constant ramp-rate, the instantaneous order parameter shows hysteresis. Fig. 6 shows the hysteresis in the instantaneous order parameter $\psi(t)$ as the view-angle ϕ is ramped up and down at small ramp-rates in the range of 1.5×10^{-5} to 6.66×10^{-6} radians/unit time. We obtain the clear hysteresis loops for all the four system sizes. The loops are centered about the view-angle ϕ values which match the critical ϕ values as estimated from Figs. 2 and 3.

The above results show the effects of the variation of the view-angle on the collective motion of the particles. As we reduce the view-angle we are in effect doing two things – we are reducing the size of the neighborhood, and we are also introducing an increasing degree of anisotropy or directionality in the interaction of the particle with its




FIG. 4. Probability distribution of the instantaneous order parameter $\psi(t)$ for (a) $L = 16$, $\phi = 0.270\pi$ (b) $L = 20$, $\phi = 0.217\pi$ (c) $L = 24$, $\phi = 0.185\pi$ (d) $L = 28$, $\phi = 0.165\pi$.




FIG. 5. A section of instantaneous order parameter $\psi(t)$ time-series close to the phase transition. The jumps between ordered state (with $\langle\psi(t)\rangle \approx 0.6$) and disordered state (with $\langle\psi(t)\rangle \approx 0.1$) are clearly seen. Here the system size $L = 28$ and the view-angle $\phi = 0.165\pi$.

neighbors. Therefore it would be of interest to know how the effects would differ if the size of the neighborhood is varied while the interaction remains isotropic. In Fig. 7 we have shown a comparison of the variation of the order parameter $\langle\psi(t)\rangle$ as a function of the size of the neighborhood. The size, as measured by the area of the neighborhood A , is varied in two ways – by varying the view-angle ϕ from 0 to π (as radius $R = 1$ is held constant), and by varying the radius R from 0 to 1 (as the view-angle $\phi = \pi$ is held constant). The results differ qualitatively. In the first case, as we have already dis-




FIG. 6. Hysteresis in the variation of the instantaneous order parameter $\psi(t)$ with the instantaneous view angle $\phi(t)$ (in units of π) for (a) $L = 16$, ramp rate 1.15×10^{-4} (b) $L = 20$, ramp rate 1.50×10^{-5} (c) $L = 24$, ramp rate 6.66×10^{-6} (d) $L = 28$, ramp rate 6.66×10^{-6} . The ramp-rate is in radians/unit time. The arrows indicate ramp-up and ramp-down sections of the hysteresis curves. Each hysteresis loop is obtained by averaging over 100 independent realizations.

cussed above, we have a first order phase transition at the critical area $A_c \approx 0.5$ (which corresponds to $\phi \approx 0.16\pi$) and a non-monotonic variation of the order parameter with a maximum around $A \approx 1$. In the second case we have a monotonic fall in the order parameter as the area of the neighborhood decreases, with no obvious indication of a phase transition. But in fact there does appear to be a second order phase transition which is obscured by the finite size effects. This can be seen from the behavior of the variance of the order parameter $\sigma^2(A, L)$ as a function of the neighborhood area A , defined by [14, 36]

$$\sigma^2(A, L) = L^2[\langle\psi^2(t)\rangle - \langle\psi(t)\rangle^2]. \quad (8)$$

This variance is expected to diverge at a second order phase transition. In Fig. 8 we have shown both the order parameter and the variance of the order parameter as functions of the neighborhood area, which is varied by varying the neighborhood radius holding the view-angle fixed at the maximum value $\phi = \pi$. In Fig. 8 (a), which shows the order parameter as a function of the neighborhood area A for four different system sizes $L = 24, 28, 32, 36$, the phase-transition is not clearly discernible. But in Fig. 8(b), which shows the variance of the order parameter as a function of the neighborhood area, we have a clear peak around $A \approx 1$ which becomes more pronounced as the system size increases (it is expected to diverge as $L \rightarrow \infty$). To establish the presence of this phase-transition conclusively and to characterize its nature (i.e., second or first order transition) one would need to do detailed finite size scaling analysis. Here we

only wish to underline the point that the first-order phase transition with view-angle as the control parameter discussed in this work is not only the effect of the variation in the size of the interaction neighborhood, but also the effect of the change in the degree of directionality of the interaction.




FIG. 7. (Color online) Order parameter $\langle \psi(t) \rangle$ as a function of the area of the interaction neighborhood A . The black curve is for fixed radius $R = 1$ neighborhood (for which $A = \phi$ numerically) and the red curve for the fixed view-angle $\phi = \pi$ (for which $A = R^2$ numerically). Both curves are for the system size $L = 28$.




FIG. 8. (Color online) The plots of (a) order parameter $\langle \psi(t) \rangle$ vs interaction neighborhood area A (in units of π), (b) Variance $\sigma^2(A, L)$ vs neighborhood area A (in units of π). The area varied by varying the radius R , with view-angle $\phi = \pi$ fixed. so that numerically $A = R^2$. The symbols cross, circle, square and diamond respectively correspond to $L = 24, 28, 32, 36$ in that order.

Before concluding, we shall discuss one recent report by Nguyen et al.[37], who also have studied the same model as we have in this study. In their work they estimate the critical noise η_c as a function of the view-angles ϕ .

Based on their observations they claim that for $\phi < 0.5\pi$ the critical noise is zero, or in other words the ordered state does not exist for the view-angles $\phi < 0.5\pi$ in the presence of the noise (i.e, $\eta > 0$). They discuss the implication of this observation to the presence of the phenomenon of collective motion (which they call flocking) in certain animal species and its absence in others. They draw the conclusion that the prey species, which presumably have view-angle $\phi > 0.5\pi$, do display flocking behavior; whereas the predator species with view angle $\phi < 0.5\pi$ do not. This claim would be more substantial if this critical view angle value of 0.5π were robust to some variation in other parameters (velocity v , density ρ , radius of interaction R); because the parameter values they have chosen $\rho = 1.0, R = 1, v = 1.0$ have no special physical significance. But as we have seen in the present study, where ρ and R have same values but $v = 0.5$, the ordered state does persist all the way down to $\phi = 0.2\pi$ (for non-zero noise, i.e, $\eta = 0.3$). In fact, we obtain a higher degree of order at $\phi = 0.35\pi$ than at $\phi = 1.0\pi$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have done a Monte Carlo simulation study of a modified Vicsek model in two dimensions. We have studied the effect of the variation of the view-angle on the collective motion of the particles. We found that as the view-angle is reduced the order in the system varies non-monotonically; the order parameter at first decreases slowly and then increases, attaining a maximum at a remarkably low view-angle, just before the system undergoes a first order phase transition to a disordered state. The results are qualitatively different when we reduce the radius of the (circular) neighborhood – in this case the order parameter decreases monotonically and goes to zero continuously. And the variance of the order parameter shows a peak for a certain value of the neighborhood radius, suggesting there could be a second order order-disorder phase transition. Considering the importance of the limited view-angle in modeling the motion of real world systems, such as flocks of birds, it would be interesting to study if similar phase transitions arise in other models of self-propelled particles, when the angular range of inter-particle interaction in such models is varied.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge financial support from Board of College and University Development, Savitribai Phule Pune University. This work was carried with HPC facilities provided by Centre for Development of Advanced Computing (CDAC) and also HPC facilities under the DST-FIST program at the Department of Physics, SPPU.

We wish to thank Prof. R. K. Pathak and Dr. P. Durganandini for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] C. Becco, N. Vandewalle, J. Delcourt, and P. Poncin, *Phys A* **367**, 487 (2006).
 - [2] I. D. Couzin and J. Krause, *Adv Study Behav* **32**, 1 (2003).
 - [3] M. Ballerini, N. Cabibbo, R. Candelier, A. Cavagna, E. Cisbani, I. Giardina, A. Orlandi, G. Parisi, A. Procaccini, M. Viale, and V. Zdravkovic, *Anim. Behav.* **76**, 201 (2008).
 - [4] H. P. Zhang, A. Be'er, R. S. Smith, E.-L. Florin, and H. L. Swinney, *Euro Phys Lett* **87**, 48011 (2009).
 - [5] N. C. Darnton, L. Toner, S. Rojevsky, and H. C. Berg, *Biophys. J* **98**, 2082 (2010).
 - [6] F. Peruani, J. Starruß, V. Jakovljevic, L. Søgaard-Anderson, A. Deutsch, and M. Bär, *Phys Rev Lett* **108**, 098102 (2012).
 - [7] A. E. Turgut, H. Çelikkanat, F. Gökçe, and E. Şahin, *Swarm Intell* **2**, 97 (2008).
 - [8] H. Ke, S. Ye, R. L. Carroll, and K. Showalter, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **114**, 5462 (2010).
 - [9] I. Buttinoni, J. Bialké, F. Kümmel, H. Löwen, C. Bechinger, and T. Speck, *Phys Rev Lett* **110**, 238301 (2013).
 - [10] A. Kudrolli, G. Lumay, D. Volfson, and L. S. Tsimring, *Phys Rev Lett* **100**, 058001 (2008).
 - [11] I. S. Aranson, D. Volfson, and L. S. Tsimring, *Phys Rev E* **75**, 051301 (2007).
 - [12] V. Narayan, N. Menon, and S. Ramaswamy, *J. Stat. Mech.* **2006**, P01005 (2006).
 - [13] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **75**, 1226 (1995).
 - [14] H. Chaté, F. Ginelli, G. Grégoire, and F. Raynaud, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 046113 (2008).
 - [15] G. Grégoire, H. Chaté, and Y. Tu, *Phys. D* **181**, 157 (2003).
 - [16] J. Toner and Y. Tu, *Phys Rev E* **58**, 4828 (1998).
 - [17] H. Levine, W.-J. Rappel, and I. Cohen, *Phys Rev E* **63**, 017101 (2000).
 - [18] G. Grégoire and H. Chaté, *Phys Rev Lett* **92**, 025702 (2004).
 - [19] H. Chaté, F. Ginelli, G. Gregoire, F. Peruani, and F. Raynaud, *Eur. Phys. J. B.* **64**, 451 (2008).
 - [20] T. Vicsek and A. Zafeiris, *Phys. Rep.* **517**, 71 (2012).
 - [21] A. Menzel, *Phys. Rep.* **554**, 1 (2015).
 - [22] B.-M. Tian, H.-X. Yang, W. Li, W.-X. Wang, B.-H. Wang, and T. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 052102 (2009).
 - [23] Y.-J. Li, S. Wang, Z.-L. Han, B.-M. Tian, Z.-D. Xi, and B.-H. Wang, *Eur. Phys. J.* **93**, 68003 (2011).
 - [24] J. Gao, S. Havlin, X. Xu, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys Rev E* **84**, 046115 (2011).
 - [25] H.-X. Yang and Z. Rong, *Phys. A* **432**, 180 (2015).
 - [26] D. McComb and S. Kajiura, *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**, 482 (2008).
 - [27] G. Martin and G. Katzir, *Brain Behav Evol* **53**, 55 (1999).
 - [28] G. Jékely, J. Colombbelli, H. Hausen, K. Guy, E. Stelzer, F. Nédélec, and D. Arendt, *Nature* **456**, 395 (2008).
 - [29] G. Baglietto and E. V. Albano, *Phys Rev E* **80**, 050103(R) (2009).
 - [30] H. Gould, J. Tobochnik, and W. Christian, *An Introduction to Computer Simulation Methods: Applications to Physical Systems* (Addison-Wesley, San Francisco, 2006).
 - [31] X.-G. Wang, C.-P. Zhu, C.-Y. Yin, D.-S. Hu, and Z.-J. Yan, *Phys. A* **392**, 2398 (2013).
 - [32] K. Binder, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **60**, 487 (1997).
 - [33] E. B. Privman, *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulations of Statistical Systems* (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 1990).
 - [34] S. Lübeck, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **18**, 3977 (2004).
 - [35] M. Henkel, H. Hinrichsen, and S. Lübeck, *Non-equilibrium Phase Transitions, Volume 1* (Springer, 2008).
 - [36] G. Baglietto and E. V. Albano, *Phys Rev E* **78**, 021125 (2008).
 - [37] P. T. Nguyen, S.-H. Lee, and V. T. Ngo, *Phys Rev E* **92**, 032716 (2015).